

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

DANIEL JAMES TREBIATOWSKI,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 15-CV-245

**UNKNOWN, Lt. & Deputies of
Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department**

Defendants.

SCREENNG ORDER

The plaintiff, who is confined at Milwaukee County House of Correction, filed a pro se complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that his civil rights were violated. This matter comes before the court on the plaintiff's petition to proceed *in forma pauperis*. He has been assessed and paid an initial partial filing fee of \$9.41.

The Court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The Court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised claims that are legally "frivolous or malicious," that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).

A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in

law or in fact. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *Hutchinson ex rel. Baker v. Spink*, 126 F.3d 895, 900 (7th Cir. 1997). The Court may, therefore, dismiss a claim as frivolous where it is based on an indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327. “Malicious,” although sometimes treated as a synonym for “frivolous,” “is more usefully construed as intended to harass.” *Lindell v. McCallum*, 352 F.3d 1107, 1109-10 (7th Cir. 2003) (citations omitted).

To state a cognizable claim under the federal notice pleading system, the plaintiff is required to provide a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that [he] is entitled to relief[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). It is not necessary for the plaintiff to plead specific facts and his statement need only “give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). However, a complaint that offers “labels and conclusions” or “formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555). To state a claim, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, “that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the

reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). The complaint allegations “must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (citation omitted).

In considering whether a complaint states a claim, courts should follow the principles set forth in *Twombly* by first, “identifying pleadings that, because they are no more than conclusions, are not entitled to the assumption of truth.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679. Legal conclusions must be supported by factual allegations. *Id.* If there are well-pleaded factual allegations, the court must, second, “assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief.” *Id.*

To state a claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that: 1) he was deprived of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States; and 2) the deprivation was visited upon him by a person or persons acting under color of state law. *Buchanan-Moore v. County of Milwaukee*, 570 F.3d 824, 827 (7th Cir. 2009) (citing *Kramer v. Village of North Fond du Lac*, 384 F.3d 856, 861 (7th Cir. 2004)); see also *Gomez v. Toledo*, 446 U.S. 635, 640 (1980). The Court is obliged to give the plaintiff’s *pro se* allegations, “however inartfully pleaded,” a liberal construction. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)).

According to the complaint, in 2009, the plaintiff was arrested and confined in the Ozaukee County Jail. He requested to check his blood sugar because his blood sugar felt high. According to the plaintiff, the defendants denied his requests to check his blood sugar and to take insulin. As a result, the plaintiff alleges that he went into a diabetic coma and had to be hospitalized. The plaintiff claims that the defendants violated his rights because they denied him his medication and failed to provide him with the health care he needed until it was too late. For relief, the plaintiff seeks monetary damages.

The plaintiff states a constitutional deliberate indifference to a serious medical need claim under either the Eighth Amendment (if he was a prisoner) or the Fourteenth Amendment (if he was a pretrial detainee). *See Smith v. Knox Cnty. Jail*, 666 F.3d 1037, 1039 (7th Cir. 2012) (citing *Williams v. Rodriguez*, 509 F.3d 392, 401 (7th Cir. 2007)).

The plaintiff is suing Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department lieutenants and deputies who work at the Ozaukee County Jail. He states that he does not know the defendants' names, and cannot obtain their names, because he is no longer confined at the Ozaukee County Jail. The Court will substitute the Ozaukee County Sheriff, James Johnson, as defendant for the purpose of service of the complaint. *See Donald v. Cook Cnty. Sheriff's Dep't*, 95 F.3d 548, 555 n.3 (7th Cir. 1996) Once Sheriff Johnson has answered the

complaint, the Court will enter a Scheduling Order. The plaintiff will then need to use discovery – that is, direct written questions to the Sheriff's attorney – to identify the names of the lieutenants and deputies who were personally involved in his claim. The Scheduling Order will contain a deadline for the plaintiff to file an amended complaint naming the individuals involved in his claim.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 2) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Ozaukee County Sheriff, James Johnson, is a defendant in this case until the plaintiff identifies the Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department lieutenants and deputies personally involved in his claim.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the United States Marshal shall serve a copy of the complaint and this order upon the named defendant (Ozaukee County Sheriff James Johnson) pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4. The plaintiff is advised that Congress requires the U.S. Marshals Service to charge for making or attempting such service. 28 U.S.C. § 1921(a). The current fee for waiver-of-service packages is \$8.00 per item mailed. The full fee schedule is provided at 28 C.F.R. §§ 0.114(a)(2), (a)(3). Although Congress requires the court to order service by the U.S. Marshals

Service precisely because *in forma pauperis* plaintiffs are indigent, it has not made any provision for these fees to be waived either by the court or by the U.S. Marshals Service.

IT IS ALSO ORDERED that the named defendant (Sheriff Johnson) shall file a responsive pleading to the complaint.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Milwaukee County Sheriff or his designee shall collect from the plaintiff's prison trust account the \$340.59 balance of the filing fee by collecting monthly payments from the plaintiff's prison trust account in an amount equal to 20% of the preceding month's income credited to the prisoner's trust account and forwarding payments to the clerk of the court each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10 in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). The payments shall be clearly identified by the case name and number assigned to this action.

IT IS ALSO ORDERED that copies of this order be sent to the Milwaukee County Sheriff. A copy should also be sent to Maricela Castillo and Mary Wenten at the Milwaukee County House of Correction.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the plaintiff shall submit all correspondence and legal material to:

Office of the Clerk
United States District Court
Eastern District of Wisconsin
362 United States Courthouse
517 E. Wisconsin Avenue

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202

PLEASE DO NOT MAIL ANYTHING DIRECTLY TO THE COURT'S CHAMBERS. It will only delay the processing of the matter. As each filing will be electronically scanned and entered on the docket upon receipt by the clerk, the plaintiff need not mail copies to the defendants. All defendants will be served electronically through the court's electronic case filing system. The plaintiff should also retain a personal copy of each document filed with the court.

The plaintiff is further advised that failure to make a timely submission may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute. In addition, the parties must notify the Clerk of Court of any change of address. Failure to do so could result in orders or other information not being timely delivered, thus affecting the legal rights of the parties.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 9th day of June, 2015.

BY THE COURT:


HON. RUDOLPH T. RANDA
U.S. District Judge